



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

called the founder of the Medieval Papacy when he was a greater opponent of everything which that institution represented, and of the whole basis upon which it rested, than any other man in Europe. And at the same time he has received no honour for that which is his greatest glory", *viz.*, the repudiation of the title "Universal Pope".

"Another main point on which this history differs from others has regard to the period which is to be held as the zenith of the Roman Empire. . . . Any unprejudiced examination will show that it was in the 4th century that the empire attained its zenith, and not in the 2nd." Possibly if General Young had studied the civil and financial administration more closely and had not been biassed by his zeal for Christianity, he would not have enunciated this opinion. There are eighteen "other points upon which this history either takes a different view from that usually held, or brings to notice facts seldom recognized". Of these the most interesting is "the different view from the one usually held as to the reason why the western half of the Roman Empire fell before the northern races, and as to the lesson taught thereby". He considers that the cause of the downfall was the lack of universally compulsory military service in the Empire and the fact that the cradles were not kept filled. With regard to the latter point, he says:

Any nation can do this which really tries. Liberal assistance from the State for each child born (illegitimate children included), the bearing by the State of the cost of maintaining and educating all children wherever it is necessary, and above all the strict removal of any slur upon illegitimacy on the part of the State, will always produce the desired effect if the nation is in earnest on the subject.

These remarks "were written more than a year before the war now raging in Europe began. The strong parallel to the case of England in many particulars . . . is self-evident."

The most interesting portions of the work are some of the comments on military affairs, in which the author is especially versed. Some of the comparisons of Roman and British conditions are provocative of thought, and his account of the daring deeds of the early Moslems is made more vivid from the experiences which the English have had with similar fanatics in India. Although he praises many for their military exploits, possibly the individual to whom he gives the most unstinted praise is Justinian's great general, Belisarius, whose bravery, loyalty, and skill in military tactics under the most adverse conditions he admirably describes.

DANA C. MUNRO.

*The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire: a History of the Osmanlis up to the Death of Bayezid I. (1300-1403).* By HERBERT ADAMS GIBBONS, Ph.D. (New York: The Century Company. 1916. Pp. 379.)

DR. GIBBONS breaks ground for a critical study of the early history of the Ottoman Turks, by describing in four chapters with abundant

notes and references the reigns of their first four rulers. Two appendixes discuss "traditional misconceptions". Full chronological tables are followed by extensive classified and alphabetical bibliographies and a short analytical index.

The best feature of the work is the bibliographical study, which includes in about five hundred titles Byzantine writers, translated Turkish historians, chronicles of various peoples, state papers, popular songs, and European books. Some items have been overlooked, such as Minerbeti's description of the battle of Nicopolis, Norberg's translation of Ali's shorter history, Oksza's *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman* (1871), Langmantel's critical edition of Schiltberger (1885), Novakovitch's *Srbi i Turci* with its references (1893), and Kling's *Die Schlacht bei Nikopolis* (1906).

Dr. Gibbons, desiring to present new aspects of Ottoman history, suggests interesting discussions, as, for example, whether Osman was converted from paganism to Islam, and whether the Ottoman power was not the successor of the Byzantine rather than of the Seljuk empire. Unfortunately the search for novelty appears to influence somewhat his selection and judgment of the facts. The preface, notes, and appendixes reveal a degree of self-consciousness and an interest in displaying the errors of predecessors that would be more tolerable if Dr. Gibbons were himself more exact: for instance, the text and notes 2 and 3 on page 214 contain charges of error against Wylie and Lavissee which result largely from Dr. Gibbons's own inaccuracies in note-taking; had he written LXXXV instead of 85 he would have been led to the authority, whether mistaken or not, for the affirmation that Henry IV. of England (as Earl of Derby and not "Count of Lancaster") took part in the Nicopolis expedition; and had he copied Coville's (not Lavissee's) comma after "Nicopoli", he would not have accused the French historian of locating that city on the shores of the Baltic.

A more fundamental deficiency lies in a failure to analyze and appraise the testimony of the Ottoman historians, even as thoroughly as can be done without a knowledge of their languages. Despite its late commission to writing, the Turkish tradition probably contains the fullest and most reliable evidence for "the foundation of the Ottoman Empire". Dr. Gibbons follows the precedents he deprecates in quoting mainly from Seadeddin, who wrote his compilation a century after the works of Ashik-Pasha-zadeh and Neshri. While repeatedly criticizing others for similar confusions, he has fused into one the historians Muhiyeddin (d. 1550) and Ali (d. 1599).

A number of doubtful statements are presented in positive language, even though resting only on the argument from silence: "Ertogrul, *who never saw the sea*" (p. 33); "Neither Alaeddin himself nor his predecessors had ever acknowledged the suzerainty of the house of Osman" (p. 166). Definite settlement is attempted of the standing puzzles in regard to Bayezid's cage (p. 255), and the derivations of "Stamboul"

and "Amorath-Bacquin" (pp. 199, 213). There are a few direct errors, as that John Hunyadi was the son of King Sigismund (p. 194), and that Bayezid I. was the last Ottoman ruler to marry formally (p. 183). Minor errors are the repeated use of "Monicego" and "Cuspianus" for "Mocenigo" and "Cuspinianus", and incorrect citations, as on page 255, where ii, 92 is written for V. 96. There are some contradictions: "Bayezid, from the very beginning of his reign [1389] . . . sought alliances with the Sultan of Egypt and other Moslem rulers" (p. 182); "Neither he [Bayezid I. in 1396] nor his ancestors had ever had dealings with the Moslem princes of Asia" (p. 216, see also p. 122). The statement on page 157 (note 1) that "It was not until Murad II. that even the sovereign had a harem" is contradicted by statements on pages 160, 230, 235, 255, 256, and 257.

An insufficient preliminary study had been made of the Mohammedan religious system (see the discussion of *Kanunnameh*, pp. 72, 73) and of the growth and character of the Turkish army (pp. 76 ff., 115 ff., 218 ff.). The use of Byzantine and western historians suffers from a lack of general criticism, but is extensive and careful. On the whole, while verification is often necessary, Dr. Gibbons's book represents substantial and important work, and contains much valuable comment and construction.

ALBERT HOWE LYBYER.

*Studies in Tudor History.* By W. P. M. KENNEDY, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.  
(London: Constable and Company. 1916. Pp. x, 340.)

THE ten essays of which this book is composed fall into two very different categories. The first two and the fifth, on the Policy of Henry VII., Henry VIII. and Clement VII., and the Difficulties of Queen Mary, are little more than clear but commonplace summaries of the principal events of these reigns; they are in fact just the sort of thing that might reasonably be expected of a good senior in any of our leading universities, with the standard secondary authorities at his disposal. The remaining seven, on the other hand, are much more minute and special in their scope, and deal with various aspects of ecclesiastical life in Tudor times. The last, which is by far the most technical of all, treats of "Reservation [in the Eucharistic sense] under the Anglican Prayer-book".

In his preface the author modestly tells us that "the specialist will find little new in this volume"; and he further states that he has "not thought it necessary to burden such a book as this with foot-notes or lists of authorities", and that "the general reader must accept in good faith" his "statements of facts". For the more elementary portion of his work all this is true and justifiable enough; but Mr. Kennedy has deprived his more ambitious essays of such measure of value as they possess by refusing to tell his readers what his "sources" are. Few except serious students of the period will care to peruse these more